

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 25-42 are currently pending. Claims 41 and 42 are withdrawn without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 25, 30, 35, and 36, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at pages 16-19. Claims 1-24 were previously canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter.

No new matter has been introduced. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a)

Claims 25, 27-30, and 32-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,552,833 to Henmi, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Henmi”).

Claims 26 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henmi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,914,712 to Sartain, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Sartain”).

Claims 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Henmi and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,787,259 to Haroun, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Haroun”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 25 recites, *inter alia*:

“A reception device for controlling a recording module,
comprising:

**...said particular format file including text based control
commands that control said recording module,**

**wherein the control means converts the text based control
commands to codes based on pre-registered product
information of the recording module so that recording modules
with different code systems are controlled after the recording
modules are registered.**” (Emphasis added)

The Office Action (see page 3) relies on column 4, lines 1-14, column 6, lines 4-14, and column 11, line 54-column 6, line 12 of Henmi to reject said particular format file including text based control commands that control said recording module, as recited in claim 25 (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully traverses because Henmi’s teletext is descriptive information of programs (see date information, and title information disclosed in page 4, lines 1-5 of Henmi as examples) **in contrast with the claimed text based control commands** (see 00H for stopping command and 01H for reproducing command in Figure 4 of Applicant’s submitted Specification as examples) that control said recording module. Applicant respectfully submits that the control information of Henmi such as a starting instruction and a termination instruction is generated when the teletext is coincided with the timer information. The control information of Henmi is not included in the teletext.

Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure of descriptive information of programs, as described in Henmi, fails to disclose or suggest text based control commands as recited in claim 25.

The Office Action (see page 4) relies on column 6, line 62-column 7, line 10 and column 13, line 55-column 14, line 15 of Henmi to reject wherein the control means converts the text based control commands to codes based on pre-registered product information of the recording module so that recording modules with different code systems are controlled after the recording modules are registered, as recited in claim 25 (emphasis added). The cited portion of Henmi merely recites “an image recording /reproducing apparatus control section for generating a control signal to an image recording/reproducing apparatus by control information obtained by the added data recorder section.” Nothing in Henmi teaches or suggests that the generation is based on pre-registered product information of the recording module so that recording modules with different code systems are controlled after the recording modules are registered.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 25 is patentable.

For reasons similar to, or somewhat similar to, those described above with regard to independent claim 25, independent claims 30, 35, and 36 are also patentable.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 25, 30, 35 and 36 are patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicant maintains that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicant reserves the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800